U.S. DISTRICT COURT
N.D. OF N.Y.

FILED

HOVE 10 2015

NOV 1 8 2015

LAWRENCE K. BAERMAN, CLERK

ALBANY

Besponse to Defendants
notion for sunnay Sudgement
of Dismissal

DATE: 11-17-15

My response to Defendant's notion is basicly requesting for a trial order to the resolve any and all disputes between both parties, or a judgement in the favor of Plaintiff for settlement.

Defendant's motion is based on only false statements, Constitutional violations and unethical conduct by Police and Defense Attorney. Defendant's motion is also based on inequent information that has no bearing on the incident and Pefendant is using this inelement information as a smokescreenty to take form off of the facts of this case and try to cause forus on inclermicy for example Plaintiff's criminal history and or events that took place other times in Plaintiff's life and that how no bearing on the civil situation itself.

## Defendant's irrelevant information:

Defendant's notion is filled with my criminal history, which isn't correct nor does it have any bearing on the situation that took place April 1st, 2013, which this civil suit is pertaining to.

My correct criminal history informations is that my last Felony/misdemeanor conviction is 2005. My last drug Felony/misdemeanor is 1997. And none of this has anything to do with this civil case.

Defendant also presents a situation of me being asrested in a trailor park and for being asrested in 2010 and being changed with days. Neither of this has any thing to do with the civil case at hand.

My last drug conviction was in 1997.

## Plaintiff's factual Information:

The obvious reason Defendant's motion is based on false information and irrelevant information is to course a distraction from the Facts of the case which clearly shows that Defence party is at fault And is completely liable.

In State Police made a false statement

claiming that they observed drugs is

the driver's sect. But supposedly

they have "No" physical evidence of

such finding. Where are the drugs?

Why wasn't there ever any proof

of such findings? The

2. State Police made a false statement

that Daphne Rollins told them I

possessed or was involved in drug activity.

Daphne Rollins clearly stated that

State Police lied and that she

Never" stated such things.

3. State Attorney Mitchell intentionally

State Attorney Mitchell intentionally made a false statement that Daphne Rollins didn't participate in her deposition because she was scared and Attorney Mitchell refused to add that Daphne Rollins explained to him at the day on her scheduled deposition that she never said anything to Police the right of

the incident about me being involved with drugs in any manner 4. It was Attorney Mitchell's decision to NOT take Mr. Rollins deposition because are once she verified that she never stated such things to State Police, that this would tarnish the credibility of Defendants and prove they were atfault. J. Ms. Rollins submitted a signed and Notarized Affidavit of facts of case Known to her. Ms. Rollins is also willing to partake in a deposition and testify in open court for the record of facts. b. I submitted my deposition. Ms. Rolling is willing to submit a deposition and testify in open court. Why aren't the State Police submitting a deposition? What do they have to hide? Obriously they know they are at fault and they are using false statements and false accusations. Either a summary 7. Judgement is the favor of Plaintiffs request for damages is suitable. Ora trial order showld be set to resolve the issues of facts from both parties. Attached in this Motion is Daphne holling's igned an Notarized Affidavit.

	Sloley V. Vanbramer
	Sloley V. Vanbramer 14-CV-339
· <del></del>	11-17-15
***	MAXHILLAN Sloley. Pro Se,
	Pro Se,
	75.62.001
	2508 US Roote 9W
	Bayena, NY 12143 Apt. 9L 917-834-4975
	97.76
	711-059-1915
	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
	·

Re'Sbley V. Vanbramer To Untad States Can't of the Dormers Dotact OS NOW YORK From Daphro Pollies This is in agard to my involvement in The curl cuse corcenty parding- (Stoley V. Kinhermor-14-CV-339) After reading motions blad by State Atlaney Mark Mitchell I have become filly aware of Agus accusations and falso Elatoments What users made by Esic and Bran Vanbramer, and by State attendey Wark Mit chall as well Frot and forement the stude police made blot I took sind bond poly planetold What Mr. Slobey possessed, or possibly possessed, or uses in anyway connected to day actually I never sand any of those things or anything conday close to chose things on that night of our incident what took place on Spect 1st, 2012 Tato made Une close to Mr. Mitchell on the dry what I was schools and to take my deposition Sowondly State Staney Mark Mitchell intentionally compiled falso information in his notions. Evan after being byly aware oblhe truth, he chose to dissegued the truth and solo it a motion bull of hos Mr. Mitchall had and said what I told him has scared of Mr. Sbley to the point that I was scared to took Sy I novor told mr mitchell such whings

Mr. Mil shall do soul What I have had numerous tostraining orders against Mr. Sblay, What is also another he. What never happened war did 1 Sug such Statements As a maker of fact, it was momitchell who douded I didn't need to toothey. He spontanty coked me about the incident What took place on April 1st 2013 baturean mysols one Mir. Slolay. All he sould be needed to know was is I told the police that Mr. Slolay had or was in connection with illegal drugs to which I answered "No I have no knowledge of Mr. Stoley being involved with drogs period After that Mr. Mitchell told me that was not needed since that was all the an many babaser or restranger Honorty. I am appalled to see that a state Attorney would intentionally be and say what I said Ulings What I did not say. I bead what is land a red who told singler bound and a loyal Stand pant but also a morel Standpoint What being said, I am respect folly agreet of an evalla true all that you to testing on the round in open court and doposition what way I can willingly give halhful footamony portains to the Very - maybanc recionate Mank you for your say at November